RECEIVED
JUL 1 0 2008

automatically performing the specified operation on one or more of the active routers in the cluster by transforming the specified operation into one or more device-specific operations for each of the one or more active routers;

wherein the user input specifies a configuration command for the cluster;

automatically communicating the configuration command to each of the active routers in the plurality of active routers;

further wherein the cluster comprises a first switch device, a plurality of active routers, one or more standby routers, and a second switch device; and

generating and displaying a device operational overview for devices in the cluster, wherein the device operational overview comprises, for each router in the stack of the cluster, a device status indicator, device connection information, failed connection information, and a second access icon for accessing information about connections of the first and second switch devices and the stack.

Claims 1, 8, 11, 24, 26, and 33 have been amended to incorporate the subject matter of Claim 9, and Claim 9 has been cancelled. Claims 1, 8, 11, 24, 26, and 33 now recite, in various formats and among other subject matter, a device operational overview for all devices in a specific cluster comprising, for each router in the stack of the cluster (whether currently in-use or not), a device status indicator, device connection information, failed connection information, and a second access icon for accessing information about connections of the first and second switch devices. From the above it is apparent that Claim 1 is directed not solely at an operational overview of connections between devices, but also an overview of the devices themselves.

In sharp contrast, the rejection of Claim 9 relies upon Arquie, a reference which is focused on the datapaths between various devices, but not on the devices themselves. Specifically, Arquie discusses showing a graphical representation of a datapath in FIG. 3 (col. 3, lines 56-57), and also discusses displaying a visual representation of a datapath itself (col. 4, lines 57-58). Part of how Arquie achieves this is by displaying a datapath as thick/thin [selected/unselected] and also blue/gray [enabled/disabled] (col. 4, lines 55-65). However, Arquie is not capable of obtaining or displaying any status information about the devices themselves, but instead discloses information only about the datapaths leading to those devices. For at least the above reasons, the rejection of Claims 1 is deficient.

Regarding the claimed device operational overview (formerly Claim 9), Applicant acknowledges that the Office Action is not relying on Jensen to suggest this feature. However, there is still a problem with the rejection of Claim 9. A key feature of Jensen's active/standby router arrangement is that if the standby router is called into operation due to failure of the active, the standby router has essentially the same routing and status information as the formerly active router (Jensen, paragraph [0029]). Thus, applying Jensen to Claim 1, Jensen's standby router would have essentially the same "device connection information" as the formerly active router. This is direct contradiction with Claim 1 which now recites an operational overview for "all devices in a specific cluster comprising, for each router in the stack of the cluster, . . . " (emphasis added). Because Jensen's standby router has the same device connection information as the active router, displaying information about "each" router would be misleading, not provide any benefit for the user, and would not make sense to apply to Jensen. Thus, combining Jensen with Arquie would still not achieve the elements recited within Claim 1.

In rejecting Claim 9, the Office Action also relies on Jensen's paragraph [0009], which describes a Virtual Router Redundancy Protocol (VRRP). Jensen's VRRP allows several routers to occupy the same virtual IP address, in the format of a master router and one or more backup routers (Jensen, paragraph [0009]). Interestingly, Jensen goes onto describe why a VRRP arrangement is a bad idea and in paragraph [0010] discusses ways to *avoid* VRRP arrangements. Again, if Jensen's standby router has the same virtual IP address as the active router, displaying information about "each" router would be misleading, redundant, not provide any benefit for the user, and would not make sense.

Although the Office Action relies upon Jensen for the claimed cluster (Office Action, page 3, section 5), the Office Action simultaneously relies upon Arquie for the claimed "receiving, at a single console control point for a network device cluster, user input specifying an operation to perform on the cluster as a whole". The problem with such a bifurcated rejection combining two separate references is that the specific claimed feature is not easily separated.

Arquie only allows a user to make alterations to a specific datapath (col. 4, lines 55-67), but does not discuss making changes to anything else, and never discusses overall cluster in any context. None of Arquie's Storage Area Network (SAN) 312, first switch group 314, or second switch group 318 ever experience user input "specifying an operation to perform on [any of them] as a whole", as claimed.

Instead, Arquie's user can select or unselect a datapath (change to thick/thin) and make that single datapath enabled or disabled (blue or gray) (col. 4, lines 55-65). Consequently, modifying Jensen to have features of Arquie, or vice versa, still does not suggest the claimed subject matter.